G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

L-R 73-90

1895-6

191 .

(L-R)

File No. 92

Serial Nos. 1613

Later references.

R.m. 228-04-05

B May 06.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1613

Part B for November 99

SUBJECT.

Appeal petition of Narsimhaiah Shanbhogue re. his claim to the Shanbhogi office of Kusba Annankere in the Chamarajapatna Taluk

---

Index

W D 1250—GPB—30,000 · 28-1-19

Communicated

/.

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Note

1) Docket no 244 S 12/9/98 from the Dy Comm'r Hassan &

2) Letter no 695 S 16/11/92 from the same & connected papers (now unearthed from RF no 350 of 1892-93)

One Nara Simma Boy constantly petitioning the office about his shanbogue ship & the Amanikere of Bheemarayapatna Taluk and stated that the Dy Comm'r had reported the matter & sent for orders. The Dy Comm'r who was called upon to state fully the [illegible] & date of the report

What are the reasons of the Taluk & Village Officers [illegible] Shanbogues &c] for [illegible] removing Nara Simma as they [illegible] have [illegible] ? The reasons should be recorded in the Dy Comm's statement to obtain it.

Has the petitioner made any delay? If so he will - I should suggest that the papers have passed through his hands

25/11/98

Vide Asst Secretary's order on separate S/f

28/11/98

stated that it was no
695 of 14/1/92 This was
in Dec^r 1896 but this letter
was not then for the coming
in any of the branches.
Narasimma a petitioner
again & the D.C. comm^r
was requested to send a
copy of his report
As this report had been seen
recently in a Revenue file
(350 of 1892-93 Res^t Pblic
Patels) these papers
have been taken from
that file & are now
Sub^d for orders

(2) It will be seen that
in his letter no 2770 26/8/90
the D.C. comm^r ✓ refused an
general question as to the

disposal of claims of
Shamtops of an alganate
Wks. As there were
many such cases. the
D Comm was requested
to state the facts in each
case together with his
own opinion. In his
No 695-516/1/92 the D Comm
forwarded an Enquiry
Statement of the case
& repeated his request
for a general ruling
(2) Mr Chents atts proposed
the issue of a general order
stating that in such
Cases readjustments shd
be made to conciliate the claims
of all the parties

Mr Thurston the Asst
Stated that before
leaving the order the Survey
Supt should be consulted
This was in July 1892.
Some time after in Jany
1893, there was a discussion
about the claims of
patels of absorbed Villages.
& the present case was
lost sight of in that
discussion

(4) As regards the D Comr's
letter no 695-S 1671/92, it
does not seem to require
any order. The Dy Comr's
attention may if necessary
be drawn to S.O. no book S 18/9/17
Re 14
which discourages all such
attempts to obstruct Survey Settlement
The one year specified in para
3 of that ~~year~~ order has long ago

* The records will have to be
retd

* See Manual P 270-71

elapsed. Naraimma
maybe informed that
the Sh^d apply to the
Dy Comm^r to whom orders
have been issued

My 30/9/40

(5) The D Comm^r's report supplying
the information required has
been received

One of the Statements furnished by
the D Comm^r shows that Bagur
pirkha consists of 5 villages
with a total jamabandy of
about Rs 4660. one of these
villages is Bagur in which
has been incorporated
Amanikere with a
jamabandy of Rs 1020
The constitution of Bagur
pirkha of 5 villages with a revenue
of Rs 4660 is opposed to

Rule XXXIII of the Nobpr Rules
but perhaps topographical
peculiarities might have
influenced the ~~Cesstn~~ absorption
of Amanikere

(6.) The D Comr ~~desires~~ thinks that
the claims of the Lukdars
of absorbed Amanikeres deserve
favourable consideration
This view agrees with that
of Mr Shentsal Rao's

Hy 24/8/99.

Yes - the Amanikere
yielding more than
1000 Rs, & being
alone is a very large
village & above ~~2000~~ 1000 Rs
its revenue - The Shirda of five villages
why were they now formed has a revenue
clubbed together? of about 4600 Rs - This
& has the survey seems to be absurd &
Supt any objection Rule XXXIII
to split them up -
As for his report
generally pending enquiries
until

Letter
Hy 25/8/99.

Sandheim
the Dy Comrs letters

Office note continued

OF MYSORE

In pursuance of the 2nd Commissioner's order of 25-8-99, the Survey Supt was requested in this Office letter No 1909 of 1-9-99 (P.F. 41-98) to favour the Govt with a report generally as regards the claims of the Amildar Shanbhog's of absorbed villages. Further, he was requested to explain why the villages (Bagur and Bagur Amanikere in question, were clubbed together, and to state that, inasmuch as the Amanikere by itself has a Jamabandi of more than 1000 Rs and the Constitution of the Bagur Firka comprising 5 villages with a revenue of 4600 Rs is opposed to Rule XXXIII of the Police Rules, whether he has any objection to split them

w/p.

With reference to the former part, the Survey Supt does not deal with the general question; but simply states that the claim of the petitioner was not included in the statement showing the heads of the various Shanbhags furnished to him by the Amildar, who only entered the Bajpur village with its included Amaniere as being entirely in the hack of the Bajpur Shanbhag-

(For his opinion in this case vide the last para.)

With reference to the latter part, he says that when he made the charge, the Revenue was only Rs 30·20 which did not go much in infringement of the Patel Rules. He suggests that as the charge is now two large, Bajpur which has a revenue of about Rs 3239/-

may be made a separate charge and the remaining 4 villages may be formed into another.

Finally, he says that the Dy Comrs might arrange for the Bagur Shanthoy and Narasimia (the petitioner) taking the work by turns equitably for periods proportionate to the revenue of the Bagur village and Amanikere respectively.

MK 16/10/99

The Sur Supt's suggestion to allow Narasimma to officiate as Shanboy for Bagur for a period proportionate to the revenue of Amanikere does not seem to be practicable, as the question of officiating by rotation was decided considered & given up some 3 years

ago. The Dewan was (in 1893)
in favour of the adoption of
a System of Irrigation by rotation
but Mr Bhimbat Rao was
opposed to it which has accordingly
given up. Unless the whole
question is to be reconsidered,
it is not possible to commence
to give effect to the Sur
Supt's Suggestion

25/10/88

189[illegible]

No. 2648

Name of Petitioner, Narasimmia Shanbhog

Village, Kadaba Amanikere

Taluk, Belmaraya patna

District, Kapan

Date of Arzi, 10-12-95

Date of Receipt, 17-12-95

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, Nil 2

ABSTRACT.

Reminder to his petitions of 3-2-[illegible] (submitted to the Diwan in person at Belmaraya patna) and 3-9-94.

States that he was the Shanbhog of Kadaba Amanikere - that during Survey it was amalgamated with the village - that he was consequently deprived of the means of his livelihood - that he has been praying for the last 8 or 10 years that he may be granted the Shanbhogi of some other village - that it would be seen from copy of Endorsement no. 191 of 10-2-93 that [illegible] - submitted herewith that investigation was held on his behalf and the proceedings submitted to Govt. for orders - that the Diwan also promised to dispose of his case on the proceedings submitted by the Dy. Comr. that as nothing was done he submitted a reminder on 3-9-94 - that he was in

Previous petition No. 3171 of 10-5-95 was sent to D.C. Hassan for disposal on 10-6-95.

May this be sent in continuation

The subject matter of this is different -

This refers to the Endt issued as per order on Rep. p. 47

Submit draft asking the D.C. to intimate the result of the report referred to in the copy of Endt. produced - BL 27/12

Draft [illegible] 31-12-95

the petition referred to had not been
ceived (Vide copy Enclosed) and that
e case has been pending disposal
r the last 10 years. Prays that he
ay be either be given the charge of
e Annamitkere or another village of
ual worth.

BK
20/12

(5)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 2148

dated 16-12-95 received at the

Dewan's Office from Varadappa Shanbhag of Kadlee Amaniker Chennarayapatna Taluk, praying for early disposal of his petn of February 1893 regarding the Shanbhagi of Amanikere

is forwarded, together with its three

enclosures, to the Deputy Commissr of the Hassan District, with the request that he will be so good as to intimate to this office the No. and date of ~~this~~ report to Govt ~~by the deputy Commr~~ referred to, in the copy of endorsement produced by the petitioner.

2. The petition with its enclosures should be returned.

By Order,

for Revenue Secretary

BANGALORE, 10/1/1896

8-1-96

M.G.C.P.B.—19-2-95—1,000

Gen. Serial No. 30.]

(6)

1896

RECEIVED 4 JAN. 97 DEWAN'S OFFICE.

Ref 4337/983

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Hassan District.

To L-R 92-94

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the
Government of Dewan of Mysore.
General & Revenue Depts
Bangalore.

Dated 21
Despatched 22d } December 96.
Received

Enclosures No. Petn & Wt. file

General No.
No. 5761

In reply to P 1245 & 8 January 1896

SUBJECT.

Submitting report on the petition from Shanbogu Narasimhaiya of Kasba Amanikere Channarayapatna Taluk regarding the Shanbogiki of Amanikere.

Petition 21/12

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office.)

Rec'd 5/1 Cash Records.

The Dy Comr's No 695 of Jany 92 quoted herein not in the Petition Branch. Please furnish with connected papers.

Rec'd 7/1 The Chief Secretary's Office

(X) The letter No 695 dated 16th January 1892 referred to by Dycomr in this letter is stated by the General Records to have been submitted to Chief Sec't on 16/2/92. and is not traceable further in this branch

Asst to Undersecretary
M 20/1

(X) Kindly have Engrossed search in other Brs also
20/1/97

To { New branch
D.H.O - if there are no references in New branch

M 20/1
Petn Branch.

Rec'd 21/1

(X) This is not found among the Engrossed papers filed in the Rev Records

9/1/97

Cash Branch/Current Records
Please note if the references are in your Branch

Rec'd 16/2 They are not in the Jail Br
16/2/97.

To D.H.O. Persons & papers as per order in the margin. The papers referred to in Rec'd 21/1/97 are not among the papers in D.H.O
5/5/97.

A search made in this and Engrossed books

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Hassan District-
Dated Hassan 21st December
96.

No 561
Secy

From

B. G. Krishnaiyangar Esqr
Offg: Deputy Commissioner
Hassan District-

To

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore
General & Revenue Departments
Bangalore

Sir,

With reference to your official
Memorandum No: Pet/1245 dated 8th
January/1896, forwarding petition No:
2148 dated 10th December 1895, received
from Narasimhaiya, Shanbhogue of
Kasaba Amanikéré, Channarayapatna
Taluk, regarding the Shanbhogi of
Amanikéré, I have the honor to state
that a report on the facts of the case.

case together with the vernacular proceedings connected with it, was submitted with this office letter No: 695 dated 16th January 1892 and no reply appears to have yet been received.

2. The petition and its enclosures received with the Official Memo, under reference, are herewith returned

3. The vernacular papers covering with Channarayapatna Taluk Amildar's reports Nos: 1 and 186 dated 1st July and 27th August 1896, respectively, are herewith submitted for needful reference and obliging return.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

/ W Meyer

for Offg: Deputy Commissioner
of Hassan District.

No 561 dy 21-12-96 from D.C

Genl No 4339 / 0383 from DC Hassan
No 561 dy 21/12/96 as shown in
from Regular Khane have been
submitted to Asstt Secy on 24/7/97

4/97.

189 / 11

No. 1100

Name of Petitioner Nadiga Narasimha Shanbhag

Village Kharvi

Taluk Chikmagalur Patna taluk

District Hassan

Date of Arzi —

Date of Receipt 29.10.97

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure nil

ABSTRACT.

Peta submits that the peta is the hereditary Shanbhag of Amanikere in the Chennaraya-pattana taluk; that during the Survey settlement the said Amanikere grama was included in the ~~village~~ Grama Shanbhag; that the peta has been enjoying his rights since that time the polgi amanikere to the soppu or bag has not been paid to him.

Prays that (illegible)

(1) the peta may be allowed to do the Shanbhagi work of both Amanikere and Grama for next 12 years as the present Shanbhag has been

en enjoying it for the
last 12 years, or
) the Thandlers Agrania
may be separated and made
to his distinct pillars;
to the amount of Rs. 800/-
ordered by Engineer to him for the loss
sustained by him since the
last 12 years
and
that the Shambhogs of both
pillars may be jointly re-
quired in the names of the
pety and the present Shambhog
and the pety allowed to do
entire
work for the next 12 years.

further states that the
Govt. gave him one
permit No 439 dated 2nd March
97 that the papers relating
to the dispute had been
sent for the orders of Govt
vide Govt. No 86/ dated
21.12.96 and prays for
early orders in the matter

1/11/97

Receipt from D.H.O
28-10-97

29-01-98

1898

1898

No. 383

Name of Petitioner Nadoj Narasimhaiya

Village Kasaba Shankaranarayanapatna

Taluk Channarayapatna

District Hassan

Date of Arzi 9-8-98

Date of Receipt 15-8-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

100 of 97 disposed by Rs 2077 & 15-4-97
1546

Plan Sec P.A. Nos 2935 & 2936 & 2725 & 25/3/97.

The above are not connected

23/8/97 Reference traced to Gl.

Rs: 4339/383 from D.C. Hassan Letter Rs: 561 dy. 21-12-96. Encloses the Chambhogaru of Amanikere, Channarayapatna Taluk and shown in the Index Register to have been submitted to the ante Secy on 24-7-97

4/8/98. In the list of pending letters a remark is made by the Secretary that references have not been traced yet.

There are some old papers unpaged which are to be put in order. Let Ramanna come & place them in the proper file.

25/8/98

Sir,

Submitted with reference.

6/8/98

Report the D.C. of Hassan to send a copy of her letter No 695 of 16/1/92

(I was working till now. The papers will be sent after the meeting)

31/8/98

Dy Secretary

31/8/98

ABSTRACT

Reminder to his previous petitions praying for an compensation in consideration of the fact that some of his Shakdari lands were annexed to the village at the time when Bagur Amani-tank was surveyed. He has put in 4-6 petitions to this office & the matter has been pending disposal for the last 10 or 12 years.

R. 1/8/98

MYSORE DEWAN'S
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. No. 3837
DATE 13-8-98

Mysore registered
13.8.98
mm

(19) 1898

From

The Secretary to Govt
Genl and Rev. Depts

To

The Deputy Commissioner
of the Nilgiris

Dated
Despatched 22 September 98
Received
General No. 1777/P.
No. P 170

Enclosure No.

The Dy Comrs letter No 561 dated 21st December 1896, reporting on the petn of Narasimhaiya of Icasha thandikara in the Chennanayakanpalya Jaleek, re the Thambhagi of the above village —

Has the honor to request that a copy of his letter No 695 dated 16th January 1895 referred to in the above, may be forwarded to office at an early date as the original is not

25

not available in this

office

By order

for Secretary

31/8/28

Rec 16/9

Rep= put up

17/9/98

Put up Pl. Please

19/9/98 Other file to be sent

17/9/98

Subd

20/9/98

Early in 1897 Mark Nao showed three pits (a legacy from Gunamuttagu or Nanapha) belonging to Hurriam & Co which were rep= to the Govt. Can he now remember the rep=?

21/9/98

22/9/98

Subd

I don't remember having seen the particular letter missing. The whole file of records were returned to the Kachcheri, Kegalla. She'll do nothing more in the matter.

22.9.98

Let me see the file & give Mr. Monk for type-writing about the other two pits & also whether villages at Survey Settlement

27/9/98

Cl. to 2nd Comm. with a note

From (10) 1898

The Deputy Commissioner
Hassan District

To The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore
General & Revenue Department

Dated 12th September 1898

Despatched -

Received

General No. 2444
No.

Enclosure No. 1.

Secretary's docket No. 1777 of the 7th Instant, re-
8.170 questing the forwardal of a copy of letter no. 695 of the 16th January 1892, in re-
Shanbagee of Amanikere-
Heeraipatna Taluk.

Has the honour to sub-
-mit, herewith, the copy of the letter referred to in the above.

D Devaraj

Dy. Commissioner
Hassan Dist.

GL. No. 1994
SEP 14 1898
Pet 126
REVENUE OFFICE

No. 695/5 Rev. 188 files

Hassan District

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Dated, Hassan 16th January 1892.

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Hassan District

To

The Chief Secretary to the Govt.
of Mysore

Sir,

With reference to your No. 6598/186 of the 5th September 1890, returning for resubmission with a precis, the vernacular files connected with the transfers of villages belonging to one Shanbogue to another in the Channarayapatna Taluk, I have the honor to resubmit the vernacular files with an English statement containing details about each of them.

2. It would appear from my No. 277 of the 28th August 1890, that Mr. Purnaya in submitting the cases under notice sought only for a general ruling under which such claims should be disposed of. The cases contained in the vernacular file

X Copy of this sent see Govt. this letter mj

files are intended only as illustrations
of such & require no orders of Government
at their present stage. They will be dis-
-posed of on their own merits in accor-
-dance with the Ruling that may here-
after be passed. The files may obligingly
be returned when no longer required.

I have &c.

(Signed). V. Sreenivasa Charlu

for. Offg. Commissioner
Hassan Dist.

"Lobo"

Reverend

Commissioner
Hassan Dist

189 8 (11)

From The Secretary to Govt Genl and Rev. Depts

To The Deputy Commissioner

Dated 30 Nov 1898.

Despatched 1/12

Received

General No. 3881 P

P.F No. 41-98

(464)

Enclosure No.

The Dy Comrs Dacca
No 244 dated 12-9-98.

Referring to the above, I have the honor to return herewith the papers received with the Dy Comrs letters Nos 695 dated 16-1-92 and No 561 dated 21-12-96, and to request submission of a further report as to the Revenues and other statistics such as population, houses &c, of the Bajra Bajra Amaibare (Taluk) and village separately and after they were joined to

-gether. ~~It is noted~~ The Bloom^rs also requested
the pet^rs claims extend to Sundayaur also.

2. The records and other ~~papers~~ 1-12-98
papers should be resubmitted
with the report called for

By order

for Secretary.

Cy
25.11.98

28.11.98.

(12)

Pet No 56.
1899

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Hapur district

To The Secretary to the
Government of Inpore
General and Rev. Departts.

Dated 11th August 1899

Despatched

Received

General No. 121
No.

Enclosure No. 4 of Calcutta
12 files of Ver: papers
& old accounts.

In reply to No. 3881 Dated 30 Nov 1898.
Pet. 41-98

Submitting further particulars
on the petition from Nara-
-sinhaiya of Kasba Hapur
-nikeè in the Khemaroye-
-para Talukh in re the
Shamboque of the said village.

Rec'd 11/12/98

Rec'd 15/8.

Rec'd by Legl Council 24/8/99
Secretariat

Rd 7 Pm
24.8.99.

No. 121.

S.

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Hassan District.

To

Dated. Hassan. 11 August 1899.

From,

The Deputy Commissioner
Hassan District.

To,

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore,
General and Rev: Departments.

Sir,

With reference to your Docket No. 3881 Pet: 41-98 Dated 30th November 1898, requesting the submission of a further report as to the revenues and other statistics such as population, houses &c. of the Bajjis Anaimkeri (Tank) and Bajjis villages separately and after they were joined together and also as to whether petitioners claim extend to Dindajjis also, I have the honor to submit herewith four

four statements shewing the required statistics.

2 ——— Petitioner has presented a petition urging his claim to the Shanbogue of Amanikere (Tank) in question - He states that the Shanbogi is his ancestral hak, that the Tank in question was added on to Bagur at the time of the Survey settlement about 15 years ago, that he has been ever since addressing petitions praying for the Shanbogi and Potagi and that he has been put to a loss of nearly Rs 900 being the Potagi due on the bein of the Tank. He further states as follows:—

(1) That he may be allowed to do the duties of Shanbogue of Bagur Fasla for a period of 15 years in

as

as much as the Shanboque of Bajur has been the officiator of Amanikéré as well during the said period and that thereafter Amanikéré (in question) may be separated from Bajur Fiska and given to the petitioner or that a village of equivalent berij may be bestowed on him.-

(2). If the prayer stated above, cannot be granted he prays that after the expiry of the said period of 15 years during which he may be allowed to officiate as Bajur Shanboque, he may be appointed as joint Anbdar Shanboque of Bajur, the duties being ordered to be performed by rotation.-

(3). That he would give up the Shanboqui Hak of Amanikere if the Bajur Shanboque would agree to pay him Rs 500 after he has officiated as Shanboqui of Bajur for 15 years as above mentioned

mentioned, or;

(4) That he would pay Rs 500 for the Shanboque Hulk of Bajir and have the same after officiating for a period of 15 years as aforesaid. To none of these proposals does the officiator of Bajir Faika consent vide Venkataramanaya's statement before the Amildar given on 20th August 1896.

3— As regards the Shanboge of Dindaji Amanikeri, the petitioner states that he had to consent to the same being performed by another for various reasons coupled with Government interference and prays that the Shanboque might be restored to him

4— I beg to invite your attention to the statement submitted with this office No 695 dated 16th January 1892. for the particulars

of—

& the above settlement.

5— My predecessors seem to have sought for a general ruling of Government in the matter. I think the claims of those officiators whose luck has been as above mentioned extinguished are deserving of favorable consideration.—

6— The Vernacular files relating to the case under reference are submitted

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

for Dy Commissioner Hazaribagh District

B.S.

Statistics for Bagur and Maravanahalli Firkas for the year 1898-99 D

Name of Firka	Name of village	Achkat-Excluding Kharab Extent A	Q	Assessment Rs	as	p	Deduct-Inam Extent	Q	Assessment Rs	as	p	Banjar Extent	Q	Assessment Rs	as	p	Total of Inam and Banjar Extent	Q	Assessment Rs	as	p	Government lands. Extent	Q	Assessment Rs	as	p	Jamabundy from other sources Rs	as	p	Total jamabundy R	A	P	Remarks.
Bagur Firka	Bagur	1680	27	3254	"	"	106	15	242	4	"	257	31	248	"	"	364	6	490	4	"	1316	21	2763	12	"	475	13	11	3239	9	11	The Bagur Shanbhogue is the Hakdar of these two Firkas which before the Settlement formed one Single charge.
	Honnénahalli	420	15	477	12	"	20	10	22	8	"	97	31	94	"	"	118	1	116	8	"	302	14	361	4	"	66	11	"	427	15	"	
	Daddihalli	166	24	222	8	"	21	34	29	8	"	31	38	27	8	"	112	32	165	8	"	112	32	165	8	"	30	6	10	195	14	10	
	Dyavanahalli	285	12	522	4	"	13	31	28	4	"	47	7	58	8	"	60	38	86	12	"	224	14	435	8	"	51	1	6	486	9	6	
	Chowdénahalli	305	28	400	4	"	14	33	21	4	"	116	22	104	4	"	131	25	125	8	"	176	13	274	12	"	38	3	"	312	15	"	
				4876	12																									4	063	6	3	
Maravanahalli	Maravanahalli	212	21	332	4	"	3	36	4	8	"	5	29	6	12	"	9	25	11	4	"	202	36	321	"	"	40	4	3	361	4	3	
	Mallanahalli	483	19	543	8	"	29	4	34	4	"	31	6	23	"	"	60	10	57	4	"	423	9	486	4	"	84	6	10	570	10	10	
	Kumbarahalli	634	12	775	4	"	15	6	20	8	"	227	13	239	4	"	242	19	259	12	"	391	33	515	8	"	72	5	1	587	13	1	
	Irudanahalli	207	11	192	4	"	7	19	7	4	"	4	2	2	12	"	11	21	10	"	"	195	30	182	4	"	21	7	11	203	11	11	
	Gavinakeré	608	32	727	12	"	13	17	26	"	"	187	14	158	"	"	200	31	176	"	"	4081	551	12	"		76	9	6	6285	6		

Dy Comm's office Hassan
Dated Hassan 10th August 1899

B.S.

Dy Commissioner
Hassan Distt

Statistics for Amanikere before it was joined to Bagur village

Survey Nos.	Class	Extent under cultivation & Land Revenue: Bijavari Khandy	Bijavari Kolaga	Bijavari Anana	Beriz Rupees	Beriz Annas	Beriz Pie	Amount of jamabundy from other sources: Rs.	Annas	Pies	Total jamabundy: Bijavari Khandi	Bijavari Kolaga	Bijavari Anana	Beriz	Assessed water: Khandi	Kolaga	Anana	Beriz	Inam: Khandi	Kolaga	Anana	Beriz	Kharab	Total: Bijavari	Beriz Rs	Beriz Annas	Beriz Pies
382	Bagayat	6	3	7¾	65	2	8	88	12	3	95	4	½	1108	15	10	6	14	14¾	64	6	10		2-6-4¼				
	Driy	.	3	7	2	14	7																					
	Wet	88	17	6¾	952	2	4																					
	Total	95	4	½	1020	3	7																		105	8	15½	1194	1	2

Deputy Commissioner's office Hassan
Dated 10th August 1899

B.L. for Deputy Commissioner

Statistics for i. Bagur village after it was joined with Annikeré 1885-86
the year of Survey Settlement.

No. of houses.	Total Kate No.	Total Survey Nos.	Class.	Extent under cultivation. Acres	Gr	Rs	as	P	Jamabandy from other sources. Rs as P.	Total Extent under cultivation. Acres	Gr	Total jama-bandy Rs	as	P	Assessed waste Extent Acres	Gr	Assessment Rs	as	P	Inam Extent Acres	Gr	Assessment Rs	as	P	Khanal Acres	Gr	Total Extent Acres	Gr	Total Assessment		
6 302	310	481	Dry	912	33	976	4	-	469-2-5	1239	20	3091	6	5	328	31	367	-	-	113	5	264	12	-	699-10	2380	26	3723	2	5
			Wet	292	34	1442	4	-																						
			Bagayat	33	33	702	12	-																						
				1239	20	2622	4	-																						

Dy Comm's office Hassan
Dated 10th August 1899

Dy Commissioner
Hassan Distt

Statistics for Bagur village before Amanikere was joined to it for the year 1884-8.

No: of houses	Total Khate Nos:	Total Raji Nos:	Extent under cultivation and its benig. Class	Bijavari Khandi	Bijavari Kolaga Inama	Benig. Rs	as	p	Jamabandy from other Sources. Rs as p:	Total Bijavari Khandi	Total Bijavari Kolaga Inama	Total Benig Rs	as	p	Assessed waste Inam Bijavari Khandi	Assessed waste Inam Bijavari Kolaga Inama	Assessed waste Inam Benig Rs	as	p	Kharab Bijavari Khandy	Kharab Bijavari Kolaga Inama	Total Bijavari Khandy	Total Bijavari Kolaga Inama	Total Beni
309	242		Bagayt	3	10	5¾	40	7	4	260:13·6	86	3	4½	1731	6	"	4	19	1½	132	1	"	10	1	12	132	1	"	2-19·8	104	3	10	Rs 1889
			Dry	43	19	10	943	3	7																						
			Wet	38	13	14	486	13	7																						
				86	3	4½	1470	8	6																						

Jnt Collector

Asst Commissioner Hassan
Dated 10th August 1889

Dy Commissioner

B.S.

No. 1919. 8/1-9-99.
P.F. 41-98 8/1-9-99.

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

From

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
General and Revenue
LR 92 Departments.
82 10

To.

The Superintendent-
Revenue Survey.

Sir.

In forwarding herewith a Copy of the letters noted in the margin, (~~which are returned~~), received from the Deputy Commissioner, Hassan District, reporting on the petition of Narasimhiah of Kasba Amanikere, Chennaraya-patna Taluk, regarding the Shanbhogi of the said Amanikere, I am directe

*~~LR 95-8/8-1-92~~
No. 121 S 8/11-8-99. with enclosures (with vernacular papers).

+23-5-99
4-9-99

directed to observe that the Amanikere by itself has a jamabandi of more than Rs 1000, while Bagur alone is a very large village of above Rs 1000 revenue; and that the Bagur firka consisting of five villages, now formed, has a revenue of about Rs 4600, which seems to be opposed to Rule XXXIII of the Polgi Rules.

I am therefore to request that you will be so good as to favor Government with a report ~~in the matter~~ specially as regards the claims of the hukdars of the Shanbogues absorbed villages, and to explain why in the present case they were clubbed together, and whether you have any objection to split them up. Bagur village & Amanikere

I have the honour &c.

Hy.

Office note Continued and Sub-

Ill 4/11/99 2nd Comm[illegible] Supdt

Sub 25

19.10.99

25/10/99

Rd 6 Pm.
26.10.99

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 2228
OCT. 4 1899
Pt No 114.
DEWAN'S OFFICE

(14) 43

1899

From The Supt. Mysore
Rev Survey

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE,

Agen & Rev Depts.

L.R. 92-94

Dated 8th October

Despatched ~~September~~ 1899

Received

General No. 256
No.

Enclosure No. file of Vern: Cores:

In reply to Letter cto 1919 of 1st P.T. 41-98 August 99

SUBJECT

Reporting on the claim of Narsimiah to the Shanbogi of the Amanikere included in Bagur village, Channarayapatna Taluk.

References
(to be entered only in the Dewan's Office)

Not much can be prepared by which the relation shall exist - it seems that the Government would not interfere with the existing charges by relation. But if the Supt is inclined to break the existing charges he may be permitted to do so & we may remain with the Dept. concerned to settle the claim of Narasimiah in the most equitable manner possible.

8/11/99

Prod Supt 9/11/99

13/11/99 Supt to Govt

21/11/99 Govt to Supt

9/11 31

3.11.99

Rec 5/10

46

5/12/99

PT 41/98 containing
papers is put up
to Mysore Govt
& Govt of Mysore
7.12.99

44

Survey Superintendents Office
Bangalore 3rd ~~September~~ October 1899

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Gen & Rev. Depts.

Sir

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No 1919 / Pet. F. 41-98 dated 1st August 1899 forwarding copy of Deputy Commissioner letter No 121/S of the 11th August last, reporting on the petition of Narasimiah who claims the Shanbhogi of the Bagur Amanikere

Amanikere, and asking me for an explanation on certain points.

2 The measurement of the Amanikere took place in 1881 and, as its lands were intimately mixed up with those of Bagur village sanction was given to the two being measured as one village.

3 When the Amildar furnished this Office with a statement showing the "haks" of the various Shanbhogs, he entered the Bagur village, with its included Amanikere, as entirely

entirely in the hak of the Bagur Shanboque, making no mention whatever of Parsimiah's claim.

4. In your letter under reply you observe that the Bagur Sirka has a revenue of about Rs 4,600 which seems to be opposed to Rule XXXIII of the Potgi Rules. That is the present revenue, but when I made the charge the revenue was only Rs 3,020 and represented no great infringement of Rule XXXIII

5. The charge as it now stands is too large. I would suggest Bagur, which now has a revenue of about —

Rs

Rs 3,239, being made a
separate charge and then
the Deputy Commissioner
might arrange for the
Bagur Shanboque and
Narsimiah taking the
work by turns equitably,
for periods proportionate
to the revenue of the
Bagur village and the
Amanikere respectively.
The remaining four
villages will be made a
separate charge.

I have the honor to be
Sir.
your most obedient servant.

J. P. Smith

Supt. Mysore Rev. Survey

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore.

Read

1. Petition No 2148 dated 30-12-99, presented by Varadamma, of Channarayapatna Tk, complaining that the Bagur Shanbhag, of which he was the hereditary shanbhag was absented ~~forged~~ at the time of survey in the Bagur village belonging to ~~the~~ ~~village~~ a different hobli; and praying that the Shanbhag may be separated from the village and the petitioner put in possession of the Shanbhagi thereof, ~~which he claimed to him~~

2: Correspondence ending with letter No 121/S dated 11-8-99, from the Dy. Comr, Hassan Dt, reporting on the above.

3.

3. Letter No 256 dated 3-10-99, from the Supt of Rev. Survey in Mysore,

(Here enter the letter in extenso)

order thereon

The Govt do not approve of the proposal of the Survey Supt to take the cash in the work by rotation in the present policy of Govt being to discourage the ~~changes~~ ~~practice~~ ~~of~~ ~~by~~ rotation. But if the Survey Supt is inclined to break the existing charges, he may be permitted to do so, and it is left to the Dy Comr to settle the claims of Varasimmia in the most equitable manner possible.

Draft:

8-11-99

Yr 13-11-99. From Secretary.

To. 1) The Dy Comr Hassan. with records

2) The Supt of Rev. Survey in Mysore.

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith for your information a copy of the Govt order noted on the margin on the subject of the proposal of the Survey Supt to take the cash in the work by rotation in the present policy of Govt being to discourage the practice of changes by rotation. But if the Survey Supt is inclined to break the existing charges, he may be permitted to do so, and it is left to the Dy Comr to settle the claims of Varasimmia in the most equitable manner possible.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

Secretary.

Dated 30.11.99

P

No 3867-8. 21-11-99
22
D 241 of 98.

(458)

The Govt will not object to the splitting up of the existing charge into 2 charges as proposed by the Supt of Rev Survey in para 5 of the letter above. It is left to the discretion of the Dy Comr to settle the claims of Varasimmia (petr) in the most equitable manner possible.

Proc of the Govt of Mysore

Read:-

Petition No 2148 dt 10-12-95 presented by Narasimmia of Chikkanayakanhalli Taluk, complaining that the Bagur Amanikere of which he was the Gaudar Shanbhog was absorbed at the time of the Survey into the Bagur village belonging to a different Gaudar, and praying that the Amanikere may be separated from the village and the petitioner put in possession of the Shanbhogi Office thereof.

2. Correspondence ending with letter No 121/5 dt 11-8-99 from the Dy Commr Hassan Dist reporting on the above

3. Letter No 256 dt 3-10-99 from the Supdt of Rev Surveys in Mysore

x x x x

(Here enter the letters in extenso)

3867-8 dt 21-11-99
0741-98 22

Order

The Govt are not prepared

57

to sanction the proposal
of the Survey Supdt to
take the work by rotation
in this case, the present
policy of Govt being to discourage
the changes incidental to
a system of rotation. The
Govt will not object to the
splitting up of the existing
charge into 2 charges as
proposed by the Supdt of
Rev Survey in para 5 of the
letter above. It is left to
the Dy Commr to settle the
claims of Narasimmia
(petitioner) in the most
equitable manner possible

C2 Draft

for Secretary

To
1 The Dy Commr Kasaragod
Dft with records
2 Supdt of Rev Survey
in Mysore

ಪತ್ರಿಕಾಪ್ರಕಟಣೆ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಮಹಾನಗರ ಪಾಲಿಕೆಯ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮತದಾರರ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಸರು ಸೇರಿಸಲು ಮತ್ತು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಕೊನೆಯ ದಿನಾಂಕವನ್ನು ಮುಂದೂಡಲಾಗಿದೆ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಮಹಾನಗರ ಪಾಲಿಕೆಯ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮತದಾರರ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಸರು ಸೇರಿಸಲು ಮತ್ತು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಕೊನೆಯ ದಿನಾಂಕವನ್ನು ಮುಂದೂಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಿದ್ದ ಕರಡು

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]